

Approved on 12/18/03

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION
Thursday, November 20, 2003 – 8:00 a.m.
6th Floor Conference Room
Council Office Building

Minutes

Commission Members Present:

Kenneth Muir, Chair
Barbara Smith Hawk, Vice Chair (via telephone)
Julie Davis
Mollie Habermeier
Cheryl Kagan
Michael McKeehan
Sylvia Brown Olivetti (via telephone)
Randy Scritchfield
Robert Skelton
Shelton Skolnick

Members Absent:

Javier Miyares

Staff:

Sonya Healy, Legislative Analyst
Carol Edwards, Legislative Services Coordinator
Justina Ferber, Legislative Analyst
Marc Hansen, Chief, Division of General Counsel,
Office of the County Attorney
William Mooney, Assistant Chief
Administrative Officer

Guests:

Charlotte Davis, Legislative Aide
for Senator Ruben

The Honorable Helen Koss, former State
Delegate

Councilmember Thomas Perez

Dan Robinson, Takoma Park

Dale Tibbits, Montgomery County Civic
Federation

Chairman Muir called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

Mr. Muir began the meeting by introducing Charlotte Davis, Legislative Aide for Senator Ida Ruben. Mr. Muir talked briefly about the issue of signature requirements for charter amendments and referendums. He noted that State law requires 10,000 signatures for a group to make a change to a local charter. Montgomery County's Charter requires 5 percent of the voters (approximately 24,000 people) to petition a change in a law that the Council has enacted. This discrepancy has been a concern for a number of years, and the Commission requested feedback as to why a bill increasing the number of signatures required for a charter amendment never gains any political momentum in Annapolis and why other counties are not interested in this issue.

Discussion with Charlotte Davis, Legislative Aide for Senator Ruben

Ms. Davis stated that a bill to increase the number of signatures required for a charter amendment has been introduced at least three times (1997, 1998 and 2000). She not only worked on the bill, but also testified on its behalf. According to Ms. Davis, one of the main problems getting political support is that Montgomery County has never been able to get other counties to view this as an important issue. In fact, Montgomery County was the only jurisdiction that testified on behalf of the most recent version of the bill. She stated that it's impossible to carve out an exception for Montgomery County because changing the number of signatures requires a Maryland constitutional amendment.

The argument has always centered on the growth in population, either 20 percent or 10,000 signatures. In 1915, 20 percent of Baltimore City was close to 10,000 signatures. Another approach is to change the signature requirement for charter amendments to make the number comparable to other signature requirements in the Maryland Constitution, like the referendum requirement. This approach would also increase the number of signatures required. Other counties have not supported either approach. The County needs to be able to get other jurisdictions to see that it is a state-wide issue.

Mr. Muir stated that civic and other grass-roots organizations do not want to make it more difficult to amend the Charter. Mr. Muir asked Ms. Davis if the bill ever made it out of the committee for a full vote by the General Assembly.

Ms. Davis stated that in 1997 the bill did pass the Senate, but that was the furthest the bill ever made it through the process.

Ms. Hawk asked Ms. Davis if it was her impression that this issue is viewed as strictly a problem in Montgomery County.

Ms. Davis stated that this is what she has observed the last two times the bill was considered. Montgomery County representatives are the only ones in Annapolis lobbying this issue.

Ms. Hawk also asked if the Maryland Association of Counties (MACO) had taken a stand on any of these bills from 1997 forward.

Ms. Davis replied that MACO had not expressed a position on this issue.

Dale Tibbits of the Montgomery County Civic Federation commented that Robin Ficker is not the only person or organization in the County that supports keeping the number of signatures at 10,000 for charter amendments. He also stated that this issue should not be portrayed as solely a Robin Ficker initiative.

Mr. Muir asked Mr. Tibbits if the Civic Federation has a position on the signature issue. Mr. Tibbits responded that the Civic Federation position is an inferred position because it's to go

in the opposite direction by reducing referendum signatures from 24,000 to 10,000. So it is implied that the 10,000 signature requirement for charter changes is an appropriate amount.

Ms. Ferber commented that the reason that the Council had not pushed this in the last few years was not because they did not want to see a change, but instead because there were other issues that took priority.

Ms. Hawk asked Ms. Ferber if she knew if an analysis was ever conducted on the cost of frivolous ballot issues that have been on the ballot over the years.

Ms. Ferber replied that she thinks that one of the other Commissions asked for some figures.

Mr. Hansen noted that former County Executive Neal Potter had looked into that issue at some point in time.

Mr. Muir stated that it would certainly be costly for the person who attempts a petition campaign, but he was unsure about the type of costs incurred from a County perspective, other the time it takes to prepare the ballot.

Ms. Ferber responded that one of the costs previously identified was associated with adding another page to the ballot. Also, there may be court costs involved when there is a question about whether an issue is actually charter material. If a particular issue is not charter material, the Office of the County Attorney has to take it off the ballot.

Mr. Hansen also commented that advertising costs can be considerable. In addition, some ballot questions generate a great deal of concern in terms of what the anticipated impact may be (e.g. some of the tax cap questions). A great deal of government time may be spent trying to identify what a potential ballot question means and what its impact would be if adopted.

Mr. Skelton asked how many petitions or referendums the Commission will look at during this election cycle.

Mr. Muir responded that the assumption is that there are two proposals--one having to do with term limits and the other having to do with some type of tax cap.

Discussion with Former Delegate Helen Koss

Mr. Muir introduced the Honorable Helen Koss, former Delegate from District 18 and Chair of the House Constitutional and Administrative Law Committee.

Mr. Muir stated that for many years the Charter Review Commission has been concerned about a discrepancy in the number of signatures required to petition a charter amendment in relation to the number of signatures required for a referendum. The Constitution of Maryland says that people can petition a change to a county charter with 10,000 votes but the County

Charter says that five percent of the total number of voters is required for a referendum. The County has been unsuccessful in getting any attention from the General Assembly on this issue. Mr. Muir asked Ms. Koss to explain her perspective on this issue and her opinion on whether or not the Commission should continue to peruse this issue.

Ms. Koss stated that obviously a change to the Maryland Constitution would be needed to change the requirement, but this would be difficult to achieve. This is not an issue that garners many headlines and by and large there is no ground swell of support to make this change. There are so many petitions for new parties, candidates, and referendums and they are all different. These petitions were adopted at different times, and it's still very difficult to get the legislature to focus on the whole issue of rationality. All sorts of Machiavellian attitudes are attributed to anybody that wants to make a change.

Ms. Koss noted that one of the reasons for lowering or increasing the number of signatures was to discourage people from getting involved in districts. In looking back at the last ten elections, the number of petitions on the ballot was very small. There have not been more than three, and in some years there aren't any. Ms. Koss believes that you cannot use the number of amendments as an argument for change. Other than confusion, she is unsure what the basis would be for seeking change.

Another serious issue that has yet to be resolved is what to do with conflicting ballot questions when both pass. Ms. Koss is particularly interested in this issue because when she was serving in the General Assembly there were three situations that presented similar issues but could have resulted in different outcomes if all were approved by the voters. The question was which one would take effect if they all passed. The three potential solutions are: (1) neither one would take effect; (2) the ballot question with the most votes would take effect; or (3) the first one to qualify for the ballot would take effect. She introduced a bill with Don Robertson that said if two conflicting ballot questions passed, neither one would go into effect. The bill did not pass.

Mr. Muir reiterated to Ms. Koss that Ms. Davis, Senator Ruben's Legislative Aide, had informed the Commission that Senator Ruben had sponsored three bills in 1997, 1998, and 2000 and that it appears that only Montgomery County is interested in the number of signatures required for a charter amendment.

Ms. Koss responded that there is a big danger in the petition, and as far as she is concerned, the only form of initiative the public has are charter amendments. The danger is the potential for putting in charter amendments that do not belong in the charter, but instead should be statutory. Since there is no initiative for ordinances, the public will fashion something as a charter amendment. This has happened not only in Montgomery County (Robin Ficker's telephone issue), but it has also happened in Baltimore City on rent control. The Baltimore City Council would not pass a rent control bill, so it was pursued as a charter amendment and was passed. The problem in this case was that they could not get it thrown out before the election.

Ms. Koss continued that the County's 10,000 signature requirement for charter amendments is among the lowest in the country, and some jurisdictions are as high as eight

percent. Ms. Koss stated that she applauds the Commission's attempt to change the number of signatures required for a charter amendment, but she is not sure that it will ever go anywhere.

Ms. Davis asked whether or not the question of what happens if there are two ballot questions that pass and are either identical or very similar has ever been resolved.

Ms. Koss replied that the question has not been resolved. She continued by stating that when she was in the legislature, particularly when she was chairing a committee, she would never bring up a Maryland constitutional amendment for approval in a non-election year. Since the Governor does not have any role in constitutional amendments, the amendments go directly on the ballot. So if an amendment passed whether they were conflicting ones or duplicate ones, they would all go on a ballot. When she was looking at recent ballots, there were some circumstances in which two did appear that were identical-one was a House bill and one was a Senate bill. The opinions that she has been able to obtain seemed to convey that one of them becomes effective, but the opinions don't say which one. Theoretically, if you have two that are exactly the same, they don't have to both appear, but there is no mechanism for taking one off.

Ms. Davis asked if you have two bills and both pass wouldn't they effectively cancel each other out.

Ms. Koss responded that one theory is that they cancel each other out, or the one that gets the most votes could be effective. Her concern with that scenario is how you count the votes. Do you use the one the got the most votes for approval or the one the got the most total votes because there may be an issue where one has a higher proportion of votes. The third alternative is that in some states it's the one that qualifies for the ballot first.

Dan Robinson (a guest from Takoma Park) commented that he was interested in the initiative process for cities. In Takoma Park, the city charter can be changed with 20 percent of the registered voters, which works out to be about 10 times the 10,000 that the County needs. From his perspective, it seems to be an equity issue. Takoma Park needs 10 times the petition signatures to get something on the ballot than the County based on the percentage model.

Mr. Muir commented that the issue in Takoma Park is not within the purview of the Charter Review Commission.

Ms. Koss concluded by stating that the County may want to work with MACO to garner support from other counties before pushing the issue again. The three counties that have been concerned about this issue in the past are Baltimore City, Howard and Prince George's Counties.

Ms. Hawk stated that she had asked Senator Ruben's aide if MACO had taken a stand on the three bills that Senator Ruben had sponsored. Senator Ruben's Aide had responded that MACO had not taken a position. Apparently, they have not been involved with this issue.

Mr. Muir asked Ms. Koss if she knew how many counties are charter counties. Ms. Koss responded that Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Harford, Howard, Montgomery, Prince George's, Talbot, Wicomico are charter counties.

Ms. Olivetti asked Ms. Koss if she thought the County would be successful if it were able to get support from the other counties. Ms. Koss responded that like other situations, once you have a crisis then you will get all the support you need, until then it will be difficult.

Ms. Olivetti commented that since Councilmember Praisner is the president of MACO, she would be the Commission's best advocate for gathering support from other counties.

Ms. Hawk asked Ms. Koss if she thought that the Commission should abandon the issue and move on to something more critical, or if this was an issue that the Commission should continue to pursue.

Ms. Koss responded that in light of her rather pessimistic view of the Commission's chance for success, she would suggest that if there are other critical issues that the Commission needs to review that it should concentrate on these issues.

Mr. Muir responded that Commissioners should remember that the Commission's role is to advise the Council and the Executive and not to go on a lobbying campaign for something they don't know if the majority of the Commission would support or not. He also noted that if there were to be a change to the Maryland Constitution it would affect a limited number of counties, but everybody in Maryland would get an opportunity to cast a vote on the issue.

Ms. Koss agreed with Mr. Muir's comments. She said that the only time that the vote in a particular county is determinative is if there is something in the Maryland Constitution that affects only one county. If this is the situation, then it needs statewide approval and requires approval from the particular county that it impacts. She also said that at one point there was an issue like this with development districts. The constitutional amendment to permit development districts passed statewide but failed in Montgomery County. The next year there was an amendment, which stated that if these circumstances occurred again it would need approval within the county as well as statewide.

Mr. Skelton mentioned that perhaps there might be more critical issues for the Commission to concentrate on and asked Ms. Koss if she is aware of any such issues.

Ms. Koss responded that she was not aware of any.

Ms. Koss commented that in the process of looking up recent petitions she noticed that on some ballots, it stated whether a charter amendment was proposed by the County Council or by petition. She feels that this is valuable information for the voters.

Ms. Ferber stated that the Council started doing this when it realized that voters were confused.

Mr. Hansen followed up on the issue that the Maryland Constitution recommended that it would have to be of general applicability. There are provisions in Article 11A of the Maryland Constitution, which deals with charter home rule issues that only apply to certain counties. Mr.

Hansen asked Ms. Koss if it would be, at least in theory, possible to amend Article 11A with regard to amending charters that would apply only to Montgomery County.

Ms. Koss replied that it's possible, but thinks it's not a politically or structurally desirable approach.

Ms. Davis asked why other counties would object if Montgomery County had a ballot question that applied only to itself.

Ms. Koss replied that it would be setting a precedent that would not be desirable on the whole.

Ms. Kagan asked Ms. Koss if the Board of Elections talked about minimum font size in terms of voters being able to read ballot measures that are put before them.

Ms. Koss replied that the Board of Elections had not discussed it; however, the font size had been 16 point, and there was a limit on the number of letters in candidates' names.

Ms. Davis asked how it's determined if the wording on a petition fairly describes the subject matter that appears on the ballot. Ms. Koss replied that on State related questions, it's usually done by legislative reference. This has always been an issue, and no one wants to assume the responsibility for doing it which is part of the problem.

Mr. Muir asked Mr. Hansen if the Office of the County Attorney drafts the language for the petitions. Mr. Hansen replied that the Council approves the ballot questions, so generally it is the Council's Legislative Attorney who reviews and, if necessary, revises the wording.

Discussion with Councilmember Perez

Mr. Muir welcomed Councilmember Perez to the meeting and stated that one of the issues that the Commission decided it wanted to explore this year was the size and structure of the Council. Some of the things that the Commission has discussed is the current mix between at-large versus district representatives and whether there should be a different number of Councilmembers. The Commission is also exploring whether or not the Charter should be amended to provide that a Councilmember's position is a full-time job. Most Councilmembers are currently working more than 40 hours per week, but some also have outside employment. The Commission is also studying the number of signatures required for a charter amendment versus the number of signatures required for a referendum. Mr. Muir asked Councilmember Perez to comment on these issues and to let the Commission know if there are any other issues he is interested in seeing the Commission study.

Full-time versus part-time employment: Councilmember Perez estimates that he spends approximately 50 hours per week on Council business. He is also a law professor at the University of Maryland Law School. He thinks that considering Council representation as a part-time job is a misnomer because most people would agree that 50 hours per week is a full-time job.

Councilmember Perez noted that he likes the Council's current structure and thinks that it works well. He also thinks that the work he does outside of the Council helps inform his judgment as a Councilmember. For instance, he serves on the Kaiser Commission for Medicaid and the uninsured, which greatly informs his judgment as a member of the Council's Health and Human Services Committee. Similarly, at the University of Maryland, he deals with a law and health program that performs cutting edge work and helps to shape his opinions.

Councilmember Perez said he does not mind the fact that Councilmember positions are considered part-time even though the reality is that it's a full-time job. He thinks that this anomaly is a good thing because it may attract a larger pool of potential candidates.

Structure of the Council - 9 versus 11 Members: Councilmember Perez commented that he does not have a strong position on this issue. Nine members seems to work well. The structure of the Council is such that an individual Councilmember has the opportunity to make a difference, and he hasn't observed anything about the current number of members that leads him to conclude that there is a problem with the current structure.

Mr. Muir asked Councilmember Perez if another district seat were added making the districts smaller, if more candidates would run for office because it would be less expensive to run. The idea is that two more seats on the Council would help foster more minority participation on the Council.

Councilmember Perez stated that he was planning to add another question which is how to ensure that the Council reflects the diversity of the County. He thinks that is one of the most important questions for this Commission to address; however, just creating additional seats won't adequately address the problem.

Councilmember Perez discussed the idea of cumulative voting. The concept is that an individual is given a specific number of votes for each office and that person can choose to give all of his or her votes to one candidate or allocate these votes amongst candidates. For example, if the Council has four at-large seats an individual could cast all four votes for one candidate. Every voter is given the same number of votes. This would help to equalize the playing field.

Ms. Davis asked how cumulative voting would work in a district election.

Councilmember Perez commented that it really wouldn't work well in a district election. It works best when you have multi-member elections. He stated that the history of cumulative voting is that it has been used as a remedy to address the dilution of the minority vote.

Ms. Hawk commented that the cumulative voting structure was court imposed in Worcester County and wanted to know if it is working.

Councilmember Perez stated that initially cumulative voting in Worcester County did increase the number of minority representatives on that Council. He also stated that all of the jurisdictions that have cumulative voting in place now have it as a result of law suits.

Ms. Davis brought up the issue of full-time versus part-time employment for Councilmembers. She said that from previous discussions it's clear that it's a full-time job; however, one of the concerns is that qualified individuals do not run because many have better paying jobs that they cannot afford to give up, thus restricting the pool of candidates. Recognizing that the Council tends to occupy Councilmembers on a full-time basis is perhaps another way to encourage minority candidates to run for office. In addition, increasing the number of seats may also be a way to encourage minority participation.

Councilmember Perez commented that full-time pay may stimulate some qualified individuals to run who otherwise would not; however, he doesn't agree that this would necessarily stimulate minority participation. He commented that there are other significant barriers for minority candidates. Qualified minority candidates often come from non-traditional political backgrounds such as the non-profit and faith communities. This limits their ability to raise campaign funds. Other candidates use more traditional launching pads such as gaining political party support, working through different chambers of commerce, and utilizing business contacts.

Mr. Skelton noted that these issues are things that are outside the purview of the Commission, and asked what can the Commission do to help in this area.

Councilmember Perez commented that the Commission has a bully pulpit and can shed light on these issues, even if a Charter amendment can't rectify the problem. He encouraged the Commission to address this issue in its report, even if it is outside of the Commission's purview.

Mr. Skolnick asked Councilmember Perez how many hours he spends on constituent service.

Councilmember Perez responded that at least half of his time is spent on constituent service. His staff spends significantly more time working with constituents.

Mr. Skolnick asked Councilmember Perez how many constituents he has in his district.

Councilmember Perez responded that he has 175,000 constituents in his district.

Mr. Skelton asked if Councilmember Perez believed that the size of his staff was adequate.

Councilmember Perez responded that he would like to have more staff so that his office could be more proactive, perform more constituent service, and conduct more outreach. He recruits volunteers to assist his staff.

Ms. Habermeier was concerned about cumulative voting and how much voter education would be needed, so that the public would understand the concept.

Councilmember Perez stated that the Board of Elections would need more staff and resources to perform the type of voter outreach that would be needed. He noted that the Board of Elections had issues in the past election with its failure to provide adequate services for Hispanic voters. He feels that the public can be educated relatively easy with additional staffing and resources.

Ms. Hawk informed Council staff that there is a report on cumulative voting that was driven by the court case in Worcester County that may be available.

Councilmember Perez stated that the Center for Voting and Democracy has a lot of information on cumulative voting, if the Commission wants to get a national perspective. The Center's Executive Director is Robb Ritchie.

At-large versus districts: Councilmember Perez noted his concern about the role of money in elections. District representatives have an easier time in the fundraising arena because they have less voters to reach; however, district representatives still need to raise enough money to get a particular message out. He believes that what an individual lacks in financial resources he or she can make up in organization and shoe leather. He noted his concern about new groups that have cropped up to elect or defeat particular candidates because they can easily bypass campaign finance limits. He is concerned that there may be more of this in the future. These groups have no spending limits and virtually no accountability. Money matters more in at-large elections and creates a disparity which makes a big difference. In regard to minority candidates, he feels that money is as much of a deterrent because minority candidates come from the non-profit world and faith based organizations. These types of organizations do not have deep pockets.

Mr. Skolnick brought up the issue of having a Council structure made up of 8 district members and 3 at-large members, and asked Councilmember Perez to comment on this proposed structure.

Councilmember Perez commented that the County's population is growing, and could be close to one million by 2010; therefore, it may be time to think about that type of structure.

Discussion on Commissioner Habermeier's Data Chart on Comparable Jurisdictions

The Commission reviewed and discussed the data provided by Ms. Habermeier on comparable jurisdictions.

Ms. Kagan asked if staff could add two additional columns on the chart--one which lists if there are any statutory prohibitions on outside employment and another that lists salaries.

Ms. Ferber commented that the problem with compensation and outside income is that you have to also consider other benefits or perks that other county councils may or may not receive. For example, some get county cars.

Mr. Skolnick requested that information be included that reflects the total operating budget for each of the county councils listed.

Mr. Skelton commented that the additional information that may be useful is what type of Executive/Council model is utilized in these other jurisdictions.

Mr. Skolnick stated that he had information about Prince George's County's Charter Review Commission from two years ago. Their Charter Review Commission recommended that Prince George's County go to a 9-2 structure, with 9 district and 2 at large members. The structure now is 9 district Councilmembers.

Mr. McKeehan commented that Ms. Habermeier's list comes from the Compensation Committee, and he recalled that the Committee did try to identify counties that had executive/county structures, so we are looking at comparable models of government for these jurisdictions.

Mr. Muir thanked Ms. Habermeier for her research efforts.

Administrative Items

Approval of October 16 Minutes. Mr. Muir asked for a motion to approve the minutes of October 16, a motion was made and seconded and the minutes were unanimously approved by those members present.

Public Forum. Mr. Muir asked staff about the level of interest in the Commission's public forum scheduled for Wednesday, December 3rd. Ms. Healy responded that five individuals had signed up so far including representatives from the League of Women Voters and the Norbeck Meadows Civic Association. Ms. Healy has also received telephone calls from several individuals who said they intend to submit written testimony.

Mr. Muir stated that the Commission had originally decided to have at least one public forum and possibly a second forum, if there was a large outpouring of individuals wishing to testify. Based on the number of individuals wishing to testify, one forum should be sufficient. The forum will be held in the third floor Council conference room from 7 to 9 p.m. on December 3.

Time Line for Report Submission. Mr. Muir asked the Commissioners to review the timeline for submission of the final report. The Commission has regular meetings scheduled in December, January, and February, and the draft report is due to staff on March 18. The schedule suggests that there are three more meetings to discuss the issues. He asked if the Commissioners believed that the currently scheduled meetings would be sufficient to discuss the issues and come to some type of general consensus. In the past, subcommittees were created to work on specific issues and then reported back to the full Commission. He asked if this sounded like an efficient way of working. He commented that it's a little premature to determine how the writing groups would be divided, but would like to clarify the issues for the report (e.g. signature requirements for charter amendments versus petitions, Council size, Council districts, and full-time versus part-time pay for Councilmembers).

Mr. Skelton commented that he believed that the Commission could begin to write the report after the public forum. He believed that there is plenty of time to finish the report. He also added that the issue of full-time or part-time employment for Councilmembers should be considered separately.

Ms. Davis noted that the issue of district versus at-large representation should also be considered as two separate issues because there was some discussion about increasing the number of Councilmembers, which obviously relates to district versus at-large representation, but should be a separate issue.

Mr. Muir responded that conceivably the size of the Council could go from nine to eleven members and maintain the current ratio of at-large versus district representatives.

Ms. Davis commented that in previous meetings some of Councilmembers talked about barriers for minority candidates. Specifically, two issues were raised. One was the issue of salary, in terms of people being able to afford to serve and not giving up their day job, and the other was the difficulty of running against incumbents. If you had one or two additional seats there would be at least two vacancies, and these seats could open things up for more minority representation on the Council.

Mr. Skolnick asked if the Commission is divided on a particular issue if a minority opinion is included in the final report.

Mr. Muir responded that there have been occasions where there has been a minority opinion included in the appendix of the report; however, he stated that the job of the Commission is to advise the Council and the Executive. It is important to try and come to consensus on these issues. His inclination is that Commissioners should decide what side of the issue they are on, find out who the proponents are, and state what kind of outcomes they expect. In other words, if a Commissioner thinks that the County should have an 11-member Council, this opinion needs to be discussed and the reasons for this position need to be in writing. It is important for the Commissioners to understand all points of view before making decisions for the final report.

Ms. Davis said that even when there is consensus on an issue, it's important that the Commission acknowledge that these issues were debated and there were some possible disadvantages or concerns to provide a balance.

Mr. Muir noted that he agreed that the pros and cons of each position should be included, but reiterated his original suggestion regarding the report.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Council Structure Information for Nationwide Counties Similar to Montgomery Co, MD

County	Population 2000	Council Size	Population per CM	District or At-large	County Budget (000s)	Council Budget	Outside employment permitted	Part-time or Full-time Job	Salaries	For position
Baltimore Co, MD	754,292	7	107,756	All district	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,500,000	Yes	Part-time	\$50,000	Chair
Bergen, NJ	884,118	7	126,303	All at-large	\$ 350,000	\$ 1,000,000	Yes	Part-time	\$45,000 \$28,000	CMs Chair
DuPage, IL	904,161	18	50,231	All district	\$ 514,000	\$ 1,500,000	Yes	Full-time	\$27,000 \$97,000	CMs Chair
Fairfax, VA	969,749	10	96,975	9 dist./ 1 at-large	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 4,200,000	Yes	Not clearly defined	\$44,000 \$59,000	CMs
Hennepin Co., MN	1,116,200	7	159,457	All district	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 2,300,000	Yes	Full-time	\$84,300	
King County, WA	1,737,034	13	133,618	All district	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 12,600,000	Yes	Full-time	\$104,000	
Lake, IL	646,356	23	28,102	All district	\$ 378,000	\$ 1,200,000	Yes	Not clearly defined	\$66,000 \$33,000	Chair CMs
Mecklenburg, NC	695,454	9	77,273	6 dist./ 3 at-large	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 334,000	Yes	Part-time	\$23,000	Chair
Montgomery, PA	750,097	3	250,032	All at-large	\$ 400,000	\$ 1,200,000	Yes	Part-time	\$19,000 \$54,000 \$51,000	CMs Chair CMs
Oakland, MI	1,194,156	25	47,766	All district	\$ 600,000	\$ 2,800,000	Yes	Part-time	\$31,000	
Palm Beach, FL	1,131,184	7	161,598	All district	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,600,000	Yes	Full-time	\$84,000	
San Mateo, CA	707,161	5	141,432	All district	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,700,000	Yes	Full-time	\$79,000	
Westchester, NY	923,459	17	54,321	All district	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 2,800,000	Yes	Part-time	\$43,000	
Montgomery,MD	873,341	9	97,038	5 dist./ 4 at-large	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 6,700,000	Yes	Not clearly defined	\$72,500	

Source: County governments.